



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,284	06/20/2003	Steve Burns	50277-2139	9791
42425	7590	07/02/2007	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089			TSUI, WILSON W	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2178		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/600,284	BURNS ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Wilson Tsui	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on: 4/02/2007.
2. Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-20, and 23 have been amended. Claims 1-46 are pending.
3. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-26, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, and 39-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abrams et al; rejections under 35 USC 103(a), with respect to claims 4, 6, 27, and 29 as being unpatentable over Abrams et al, in further view of Hind et al; rejections under 35 USC 103(a), with respect to claims 9 – 12, and 32 – 35, as being unpatentable over Abrams et al, and Hind et al, in further view of Burnard et al; and rejections under 35 USC 103(a), with respect to claims 15 and 38, as being unpatentable over Abrams et al, in further view of Katariya et al, are withdrawn, in view of new grounds of rejections necessitated by applicant's amendments.

#### *Drawings*

4. The drawings filed on 06/20/2003 are accepted.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regards to claim 18, it is unclear as to how a porlet generates the component (line 4, page 6 of the claim), when the component was already generated/implemented/used

Art Unit: 2178

beforehand (line 3, page 6 of the claim). Additionally, is also unclear whether the applicant is implying that in response to a user manipulating a component, a portlet is then used to generate the same component again, or whether the applicant intends to say 'wherein the component associated with a page, and as well as the event is generated by a portlet'.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-26, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al (US Patent: 6,675,350 B1, issued: Jan. 6, 2004, filed: Nov. 4, 1999), in further view of Hofmann et al (US Application: 2001/0009016 A1, published: Jul. 19, 2001, filed: Jan. 12, 2001).

With regards to claim 1, Abrams et al teaches:

- *In response to receiving a request to display the page, performing the steps of:*
- *Determining that the page is associated with a page parameter* (Fig 6: whereas a page is displayed according to user preference data/parameters for collecting data from a particular site/URL (column 4, lines 13-30))
- *Inspecting a mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter* (As shown in Fig 2a, and Fig 2b, and explained in column 4,

lines 13-30, the page parameters are checked and refined by a user (thus establishing mapping data with respect to a page parameter and a portlet parameter) to determine what summary information to display in each of the portlets (Fig 6, 630) *of a portlet that generates a component of the page that is based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter* (whereas, as explained in column 6, lines 12-25: each portlet receives parameters of the page, and each of the parameters are based upon user customized specified headlines of web sites).

- *Passing a value associated with the page parameter as a value of the portlet parameter to a routine responsible for rendering the component, and the routine generating the component based upon the value associated with the portlet parameter* (Fig 2a, and Fig 2b: whereas, the portlets use page parameters such as URL data to display page/summary information for the page located at the particular URL, and constraint based parameters to display constraint based page/summary information for the page located at the particular URL) *and inserting the component that was generated by the routine into the page* (Fig 6: whereas, the generated data/component is inserted into a page)

However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach passing a value associated with the page parameter as a value of the portlet parameter *to the portlet* that generates the component of the page, and inserting the component that was generated by the *portlet* into the page.

Yet, Hofmann et al teaches passing a value associated with the page parameter as a value of the portlet parameter *to the portlet* that generates the component of the page,

and inserting the component that was generated by the *portlet* into the page (paragraphs 0037-0044: whereas, a page is requesting, and includes portlet data for a specific portlet, such that the portlet is used to generate a component/data-content-of-interest part of a page (paragraph 0121)).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's routine, such that a portlet-method is used to accept page parameters, as taught by Hofmann et al. The combination of Abrams et al and Hofmann et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "developed an independent technique to provide access to particular information" (Hofmann et al, paragraph 0007).

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al and Hofmann et al similarly teaches *wherein the step of mapping the page parameter, wherein mapping the page parameter comprises the steps of: mapping the page parameter to a second portlet parameter associated with a second component of the page; and passing the value associated with the page parameter as the value of the second portlet parameter to a second portlet that generates the second component*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, whereas multiple portlets receive one or more page parameters, and the URL data (value of the page parameter) is passed to logic/routine(s) responsible for rendering an updated/second page).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al and Hofmann et al similarly teach *wherein: establishing a plurality of page parameters for the page; mapping the plurality of page parameters to a plurality of portlet parameters associated*

*with the component of web page; wherein the step of inspecting the mapping further comprises the step of inspecting the mapping to determine which page parameters of the plurality of page parameters are mapped to each of the plurality of portlet parameters; wherein the step of passing the value further comprises the step of passing, based on the mapping, values associated with the plurality of page parameters as the values of the plurality of portlet parameters to the portlet that generates; and wherein the step of the portlet generating the component further comprises the step of the portlet generating the component based upon the values associated with the plurality of portlet parameters, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1 (whereas multiple parameters are supported), and is rejected under similar rationale.*

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al and Hofmann et al similarly teaches *wherein the steps of mapping further comprises the step of mapping the page parameter to the portlet parameter and mapping a second page parameter to a second portlet parameter of the portlet that generates the component of the page, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, URL data is the first page parameter, and constraint based parameters are used as secondary parameters for the component of the page; and thus, rejected under similar rationale.*

With regards to claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al and Hofmann et al similarly teach *wherein the request to display the page includes a URL and the URL includes the value associated with the page parameter, and wherein the step of passing the value associated with the page parameter is performed by passing the value contained in the URL as the value of the portlet parameter (whereas, as explained in*

column 4, lines 13-30, and in the rejection for claim 1, URL data is used as parameter information, to be passed as the value of the portlet parameter).

With regards to claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *further comprising the steps of: presenting to a user a user interface for customizing the page; in response to the user interacting with the user interface, obtaining a user specified value for the page parameter; and wherein the step of passing the value associated with the page parameter is performed by passing the user specified value as the value of the portlet parameter to the portlet responsible for rendering the component*, (in column 4, lines 1-12, and column 6, lines 25-32, a user interface is used by a user to specify page parameter values including URL, constraint, and layout/positions/fonts to a routine for rendering/displaying the component).

Additionally, as explained in the rejection for claim 1, the combination of Abrams et al and Hofmann et al teaches Abrams et al's routine modified such that a portlet-method is used when *passing the value of the portlet parameter to the portlet that generates the component*.

With regards to claim 13, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *further comprising the step of presenting to a page designer a user interface for specifying the mapping between the page parameter and the portlet parameter* ((whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 1-12, and column 6, lines 25-32, a user interface is used by a user to specify page parameter values including URL, constraint, and layout/positions/fonts to a routine for rendering/displaying/mapping the component)).

With regards to claim 14, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al and Hofmann et al teaches registering the portlet with a portal repository, wherein the process of registering the portlet causes data associated with the portlet to be stored in the portal repository (Abrams et al, claim 1: whereas, a data source comprises registered profile data associated with the routine).

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *further comprising the step of receiving input from a page designer through a user interface to create the mapping between the portlet parameter and the page parameter* (whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 1-12, and column 6, lines 25-32, a user interface is used by a user to specify page parameter values including URL, constraint, and layout/positions/fonts to a routine for rendering/displaying/mapping the component).

With regards to claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches the method further comprises the step of retrieving the stored value; and the step of the portlet generating the component further comprises the step of the portlet generating the component based upon the retrieved value (claim 1 of Abrams et al, Fig. 2A: whereas, the stored value(s)/preferences/constraints are stored in data stores, which are used to generate the components 240, 250, and 260). Additionally, as explained in the rejection for claim 1, the combination of Abrams et al and Hofmann et al teaches Abrams et al's routine modified such that a portlet-method is used when passing the value of the portlet parameter to the portlet that generates the component.

With regards to claim 18, Abrams et al teaches a method comprising:

- *In response to a user manipulating a component associated with a page, a portlet that generates the component generating a particular event [w1] (column 4, lines 20-21: whereas a user manipulates a web address in component 220 of a portlet, causing the portlet in the page to generate a URL selection event)*
- *The portlet passing data that represents the particular event to logic associated with the page, inspecting a first mapping that maps events to actions and event output parameters to page parameters (whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 1-12, and column 6, lines 25-32, a user uses a component/portlet (by generating an event as explained above) to specify page parameter values including URL, constraint, and layout/positions/fonts to a routine for rendering/displaying/mapping the component), determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in response to the particular event (whereas the action to perform is to display all hyperlinks with their associated text for the selected site in pane 260 (column 4, lines 21-24)); inspecting the first mapping to determine that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter; and causing the action to be performed ... wherein causing the action to be performed comprises passing a value of the event output parameter as the value of the page parameter (column 4, lines 21-29: whereas, the URL data that represents the event is mapped to panes 240, 250, and 260, and a display action with regards to the URL data is performed).*

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the*

*page is a first page and the page parameter is associated with a second page; and the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of passing the value of the page parameter to logic responsible for rendering a second page,* as similarly explained in claim 1, the URL data (value of the page parameter) is passed to logic/routine(s) responsible for rendering an updated/second page, and is rejected under the similar rationale.

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 18, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of generating a request that specifies a URL, wherein the value of the page parameter is included in the URL:* (whereas, as explained in column 4, lines 13-30, and in the rejection for claim 1, URL data is used as parameter information, to be passed as the value of the portlet parameter).

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 20, Abrams et al teaches: *the step of generating the request further comprises the step of generating a request for executable code; and the step of causing the action to be performed further comprises the step of invoking the executable code,* as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, page parameter data is passed to the appropriate portlet parameters, and the passing of the value causes the display/render action to be performed. Since the rendering as shown in Fig 2A as performed/executed, the figure inherently teaches that code must have been executed in order for the appropriate components/portlets to have been updated with the mapped parameter values.

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Abrams et al teaches *wherein the*

Art Unit: 2178

*executable code is a web service* (column 1, lines 45-60: whereas, the executable code, provides user's with a service to collect information from disparate sources, to be displayed in a summarized and consistent manner).

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 18, Abrams et al teaches wherein:

The action comprises rendering a second page, wherein the page parameter is associated with the second page, and wherein rendering the second page (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 19, and is rejected under similar rationale) comprises the steps of:

Inspecting a mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

The second portlet generating a component based upon the value associated with the portlet parameter, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 19, and is rejected under similar rationale.

Inserting the second component that was generated by a portlet into a page, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 19, and is rejected under similar rationale.

However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach

Inspecting a *second mapping* to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a *second* portlet that generates a *second* component of the *second* page that is based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter; and

Passing the value of the page parameter as the value of the portlet parameter to the

Art Unit: 2178

*second portlet;*

Yet, Hofmann et al teaches:

- Inspecting a *second mapping* to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a *second portlet* that generates a *second component* of the *second page* that is based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter (paragraphs 0017, 0038, 0039: whereas, multiple mappings are implemented for a multiple number of portlets, such that an appropriate portlet is selected for generating a component of a page, based upon a portlet parameter).
- Passing the value of the page parameter as the value of the portlet parameter to the *second portlet* whereas, a page is requesting, and includes portlet data for a specific portlet, such that the portlet is used to generate a component/data-content-of-interest part of a page (paragraph 0121)).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's routine, such that a portlet-method is used to accept page parameters when implementing multiple portlets, as taught by Hofmann et al. The combination of Abrams et al and Hofmann et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "developed an independent technique to provide access to particular information" (Hofmann et al, paragraph 0007).

With regards to claim 24, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 1,

Art Unit: 2178

and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 25, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale

With regards to claim 26, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 28, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 30, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 31, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 8, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 36, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more

Art Unit: 2178

sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 13, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 37, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 14, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 39, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the m the method recited in claim 16, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 40, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 17, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 41, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 18, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 42, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 19,

Art Unit: 2178

and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 43, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 20, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 44, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 21, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 45, for a teaches a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 22, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 46, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 23, and is rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 4, 6, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al (US Patent: 6,675,350 B1, issued: Jan. 6, 2004, filed: Nov. 4, 1999) and Hofmann et al (US Application: 2001/0009016 A1, published: Jul. 19,

Art Unit: 2178

2001, filed: Jan. 12, 2001), in further view of Hind et al (US Application: 2004/0205555

A1, published: Oct. 14, 2004, filed: Sep. 18, 2001)

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *mapping the page parameter to the portlet parameter associated with the component of the page*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach ... *without mapping the page parameter to portlet parameters associated with any other components of the page*.

Hind et al teaches ... *without mapping the parameters to portlet parameters associated with any other components of the page* (Fig. 3A, paragraph 0024: whereas, content for some components/portlets are updated, while some are not, and thus components/portals are selectively mapped for receiving parameter data).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al and Hofmann et al's method for mapping page parameters, to have only mapped page parameters to a select page component, as taught by Hind et al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "reduced the time a user waits for receiving a portal page [by] spawning individual threads for each portlet" (Hind et al, paragraph 0009).

With regards to claim 6, Abrams et al teaches *establishing the page parameter, and passing the value associated with the page parameter further comprises the step of passing the value as the value of the portlet parameter the portlet that generates the component*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under

Art Unit: 2178

similar rationale. However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach the value associated with the page parameter is a *default value*.

Hind et al teaches a *default value* (paragraph 0032: whereas, default textual parameter data is used when data is unavailable for a component/portlet).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al, and Hofmann et al's method for mapping a page parameter to a portlet parameter, such that the page parameter value is a default value, as taught by Hind et al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "reduced the time a user waits for receiving a portal page [by] spawning individual threads for each portlet" (Hind et al, paragraph 0009).

With regards to claim 27, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 29, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claims 9 – 12, and 32 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al (US Patent: 6,675,350 B1, issued: Jan. 6, 2004, filed: Nov. 4, 1999, Hofmann et al (US Application: 2001/0009016 A1, published: Jul. 19,

2001, filed: Jan. 12, 2001), and Hind et al (US Application: 2004/0205555 A1, published: Oct. 14, 2004, filed: Sep. 18, 2001), in further view of Burnard et al (US Patent: 5,613,122, issued: Mar. 18, 1997, filed: Nov. 14, 1994).

With regards to claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Abrams et al teaches *determining a selected value based on override preferences* (column 6, lines 12-32: whereas, override settings/preferences are determined), and *passing the selected value as the value of the portlet parameter to the routine responsible for rendering the component* (as similarly explained in the claim 1, and also in column 6, lines 12-32, the selected preference values are used to render a customized view). However, although Abrams et al teaches, override preferences, Abrams et al does not expressly teach an *override hierarchy*, and passing a value as to value of the portlet parameter *to the portlet that generates the component*.

The combination of Abrams et al and Hoffmann et al teaches, passing a value as to value of the portlet parameter *to the portlet that generates the component*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1.

However, Abrams et al and Hoffmann et al do not expressly teach an *override hierarchy*.

Burnard et al teaches an *override hierarchy* (Abstract: whereas, objects at a particular level, override objects from a different hierarchical level).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al and Hofmann et al's override preferences, such that the overriding process is based on an *override hierarchy*, as taught by Burnard et

Art Unit: 2178

al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Burnard et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have “implemented an object archiving system which can manage user objects to insure consistency between various sections of a project or various projects while utilize common objects” (Burnard et al, column 4, lines 17-21). With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, Abrams et al teaches *the plurality of values includes a page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1) *and a customize page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, whereas the constraint based parameters, are custom page parameter values), as well as *override* preferences (column 6, lines 12-32: whereas, override settings/preferences are determined). However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach an override hierarchy that specifies that the URL page is the page parameter value is the selected value.

Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al teaches a *default page parameter value as the selected value*, as similarly taught in the rejection for claim 6.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al’s plurality of values such that a specific page parameter value, such as a URL page parameter value is used as the default page parameter value as taught by Hind et al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have “reduced the time a user waits for receiving a portal page [by] spawning individual threads for each portlet” (Hind et al, paragraph 0009).

Art Unit: 2178

However, the combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al do not expressly teach *an override hierarchy*.

Burnard et al teaches *an override hierarchy*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 9.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al's plurality of values, which includes the URL page as the default page parameter, to have further included an override hierarchy, as taught by Burnard et al. The combination would have allowed Abrams et al to have "implemented an object archiving system which can manage user objects to insure consistency between various sections of a project or various projects while utilize common objects" (Burnard et al, column 4, lines 17-21).

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 9, Abrams et al teaches *the plurality of values includes a page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1) and *a customize page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, whereas the constraint based parameters, are custom page parameter values), as well as *override preferences* (column 6, lines 12-32: whereas, override settings/preferences are determined). However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach *an override hierarchy that specifies that the customize page parameter value is the page parameter value is the selected value*.

Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al teaches a *default page parameter value as the selected value*, as similarly taught in the rejection for claim 6.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's plurality of values such that a specific page parameter value, such as a customize page parameter value is used as the default page parameter value as taught by Hind et al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "reduced the time a user waits for receiving a portal page [by] spawning individual threads for each portlet" (Hind et al, paragraph 0009).

However, the combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al do not expressly teach *an override hierarchy*.

Burnard et al teaches *an override hierarchy*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 9.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al's plurality of values, which includes the customize page parameter value as the default page parameter, to have further included an override hierarchy, as taught by Burnard et al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, Hind et al, and Burnard et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "implemented an object archiving system which can manage user objects to insure consistency between various sections of a project or various projects while utilize common objects" (Burnard et al, column 4, lines 17-21).

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 9, Abrams et al teaches *the plurality of values includes a page parameter value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1),*a portlet specified value* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), as

Art Unit: 2178

well as *override* preferences (column 6, lines 12-32: whereas, override settings/preferences are determined). However, Abrams et al does not expressly teach, the page parameter value is a *default value*, and an *override hierarchy that specifies that the default page parameter is the selected value*.

Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al teaches a *default page parameter value as the selected value*, as similarly taught in the rejection for claim 6.

However, Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al do not expressly teach *and an override hierarchy that specifies that the default page parameter is the selected value* Burnard et al teaches *an override hierarchy*, that each objects parameters include attributes/values (as similarly explained in the abstract, and Fig 9)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Hind et al's plurality of values, which include the default page parameter value, to have further included an override hierarchy, as taught by Burnard et al. The combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, Hind et al, and Burnard et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have "implemented an object archiving system which can manage user objects to insure consistency between various sections of a project or various projects while utilize common objects" (Burnard et al, column 4, lines 17-21).

With regards to claim 32, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 9, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 33, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 10, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 34, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method recited in claim 11, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 35, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 12, and is rejected under similar rationale.

9. Claims 15 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al (US Patent: 6,675,350 B1, issued: Jan. 6, 2004, filed: Nov. 4, 1999), and Hofmann et al (US Application: 2001/0009016 A1, published: Jul. 19, 2001, filed: Jan. 12, 2001), in further view of Katariya et al (US Patent: 6,564,251 B2, issued: May 13, 2003, filed: Dec. 3, 1998).

With regards to claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Abrams et al and Hofmann et al teaches *the data associated with the portlet, and communicated with the portal repository*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 14, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, Abrams et al and Hofmann et al do not expressly teach the

data associated with the portlet, is communicated to the portal repository as an *XML document*.

Katariya et al teaches communicating with the portal repository, through the use of an *XML document* (columns 5 and 6, lines 59-67 and 1-9 respectively: whereas, preference/parameter information is communicated to a portal repository via XML format).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Abrams et al's communication of data to a portal repository, such that the data is passed using a XML document. The combination of Abrams et al, Hofmann et al, and Katariya et al would have allowed Abrams et al to have allowed "the content of each page to have been enhanced by the rendered data from the provider objects, thereby adding dynamic behavior to the predefined page" (Katariya et al, column 2, lines 26-31).

With regards to claim 38, for a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform a method similar to the method recited in claim 15, and is rejected under similar rationale.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17, 23-40, and 46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
11. With respect to claim 1, the applicant first argues that "Abrams does not describe or suggest a mapping that maps page parameters to portlet parameters" [since] "the

parameters [described by Abrams] are user-specified parser parameters that are used by an HTML parser to retrieve summary data from one or more web pages" [and thus] "the parser parameters in Abrams correspond to neither the page parameters nor the portlet parameters featured in claim 1". However, Fig 6 shows a page generating having user-specified web summaries (specification data is the page parameter data), each set of parameter data, specific to a web site as shown by/in each tabbed window container, and each tabbed window container containing dynamically generated content showing parsed summarized/fragments of information (630) using user specified data (portlet parameters)). As indicated by the applicant, the parameters accepted/determined using the page are user-specified parser parameters, and thus, each portlet (Fig 6, ref 630) generates the fragmented summary data shown by accepting parameter data.

Therefore, since the claim language does not specify/require the parameters of a page to be non-user-specified, the applicant is arguing limitations, that are not present in the claims, and the argument is not persuasive since portlet parameters, and page parameters are indeed taught, as explained above.

12. The applicant secondly argues (with respect to claim 1), that "there is nothing in [in a selected passage of Abrams, col. 4, lines 13-30] that describes a mapping that maps page parameters to portlet parameters, or that a mapping is inspected to determine that a particular page parameters is mapped to a particular portlet parameter of a portlet". However, the page and portlet parameters determined directly/indirectly through a user selection are *used as data* for any of the constraining filters (Abrams,

Art Unit: 2178

column 4, lines 23-26), and thus mapping data is inspected to produce data in portlets), and thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

13. The applicant makes a third argument (with respect to claim 1), that "Abrams panes 240, 250, and 260 are panes in a browser window that are not capable of generating components that can be inserted into a page" [and that] claim 1 includes the feature of the portlet generating a page component based on the value of the portlet parameter that is passed to the portlet". This argument is moot, in view of new grounds of rejection, as explained in the rejection for claim 1 above.

14. With regards to claims 18-22, and 41-45 the Applicant's arguments filed 04/02/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

15. With regards to claim 18, the applicant argues that Abrams does not describe or suggest page parameters or a mapping that involves such page parameters, and further Abrams does not teach, describe or suggest inspecting a mapping that involves page parameters and event output parameters, and thus, claim 18 is allowable. However, the examiner has explained these limitations to have been taught by Abrams, as explained in the response to arguments for claim 1 above, and thus the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

16. With regards to applicant's argument that claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 being allowable, since they depend either directly or indirectly upon independent claims 1, and 18, is not persuasive, since claims 1 and 18 have been explained to be rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*W.T. 06/20/07*

Wilson Tsui  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2178  
June 20, 2007

*Cesar Paula*  
CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER